Case5:12-cv-00523-LHK Document5 Filed03/13/12 Page1 of 6

1	COOLEY LLP		
2	GORDON C. ATKINSON (122401) (atkinsongc@cooley.com)		
3	KATHLYN A. QUERUBIN (275085) (kquerubin@cooley.com)		
4	101 California Street, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-5800		
5	Telephone: (415) 693-2000 Facsimile: (415) 693-2222		
6	Attorneys for Defendant NOVUS VENTURES II, L.P.		
7	NOVOS VEIVIORES II, E.I .		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
11			
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Civil Action No. 12-cv-00523 HRL	
13	Plaintiff,	Answer to Complaint for Receivership and Injunction	
14	V.		
15	NOVUS VENTURES II, L.P.,		
16	Defendant.		
17			
18	ANSWER		
19	Defendant Novus Ventures II, L.P. ("Novus") responds to Plaintiff's Complaint for		
20	Receivership and Injunction ("Complaint") as follows:		
21	JURIS	DICTION	
22	1. Novus admits that the United States purports to bring this action on behalf of its		
23	agency, the U.S. Small Business Administration (hereinafter, "SBA," "Agency" or "Plaintiff").		
24	Novus is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the rest of		
25	Plaintiff's allegations in paragraph 1, and on that basis, denies them.		
26	2. The allegations of paragraph 2 are legal conclusions to which no response is		
27	required. To the extent a response is required, Novus admits that this Court presently has subject		
28	matter jurisdiction over this purported action.		
P Law CO	1258053/SF	DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S 1. COMPLAINT FOR RECEIVERSHIP AND INJUNCTION (CASE NO. 12-CV-00523-HRL)	

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

COMPLAINT FOR RECEIVERSHIP AND INJUNCTION (CASE NO. 12-CV-00523-HRL)

1 **VENUE** 2 3. The allegations of paragraph 3 are legal conclusions to which no response is 3 required. To the extent a response is required, Novus admits that it is a Delaware limited 4 partnership and that it maintains its place of business and principal office at 20111 Stevens Creek 5 Boulevard, Cupertino, CA 95014, in Santa Clara County. Novus further admits that venue is 6 proper in this District. 7 INTERDISTRICT ASSIGNMENT 4. 8 Novus admits that its principal office is located in Santa Clara County, and that 9 this purported action is properly assigned to the San Jose Division. 10 **Statutory and Regulatory Framework** 11 5. Novus admits that it was licensed by SBA as a Small Business Investment 12 Company ("SBIC") pursuant to Section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act ("The 13 Act"), codified at 15 U.S.C. §681(c) on January 5, 2001. Novus further admits that it was issued 14 an SBA License with the number 09/79-0433. 15 6. Novus admits that its general partner is DT Associates II, LLC. 16 7. Novus admits that it is a licensee of the SBA. The rest of the allegations of 17 paragraph 7 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is 18 required. Novus denies the allegations of paragraph 7. 19 8. Novus admits that the SBA has promulgated regulations, which are codified at 20 Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 107 (the "Regulations"). The rest of the 21 allegations of paragraph 8 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. 22 **Federal Funding Of Novus** 9. 23 The allegations of paragraph 9 are legal conclusions to which no response is 24 required. 25 10. Novus admits that the SBA provided federal funding to Novus through the 26 purchase and/or guaranty of a Preferred Limited Partnership interest. 27 11. Novus admits that the SBA provided Leverage to Novus in the amounts and on the

28

1258053/SF

dates alleged in paragraph 11.

- 12. The allegations of paragraph 12 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Novus admits that, subject to certain conditions, the Leverage is redeemable by the SBA.
- 13. Novus admits that it currently owes the SBA outstanding Leverage in the amount listed in paragraph 13.
- 14. Novus is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of Plaintiff's allegations in paragraph 14, and on that basis, denies them.
- 15. The allegations in paragraph 15 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Novus responds that its audited financials submitted to the SBA on Form 468 speak for themselves and are the appropriate source for determining their contents. Novus otherwise denies the allegations contained in paragraph 15.
- **16.** Novus admits that Greg Lahann signed Novus' audited financials Form 468 on behalf of Novus's general partner on March 31, 2011. The rest of paragraph 16 is comprised of legal conclusions to which no response is required.

SBA's Authority for Regulatory Enforcement Against Novus

- 17. The allegations in paragraph 17 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Novus responds that to the extent that paragraph 17 purports to summarize 15 U.S.C. § 687(d), the Act speaks for itself and is the appropriate source for determining its contents.
- 18. The allegations in paragraph 18 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Novus responds that to the extent that paragraph 18 purports to summarize 15 U.S.C. § 687c, the Act speaks for itself and is the appropriate source for determining its contents. Novus admits that the Court may, in its discretion, appoint the SBA as Receiver, but only if certain conditions are met as required by law.

Novus Is In Violation of the Act and Regulations

19. Novus admits that it submitted quarterly financial information to SBA. The rest of the allegations in paragraph 19 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Novus denies the allegations of paragraph 19.

1258053/SF

DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR RECEIVERSHIP AND INJUNCTION (CASE NO. 12-CV-00523-HRL)

27

28

Novus denies that the SBA provided Novus with "an opportunity to cure."

Novus hereby incorporates as though fully set forth herein its answer to paragraph

29.

30.

Case5:12-cv-00523-LHK Document5 Filed03/13/12 Page5 of 6

1	22. Except as otherwise expressly admitted herein, Novus denies the allegations of paragraph 30.	
2	31. Novus hereby incorporates as though fully set forth herein its answer to paragraph	
3	22. Except as otherwise expressly admitted herein, Novus denies the allegations of paragraph 31.	
4	32. The allegations in paragraph 32 are legal conclusions to which no response is	
5	required.	
6	33. Novus is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the	
7	truth of the allegations in paragraph 33, and on that basis, denies them.	
8	34. Novus denies the allegations in paragraph 34.	
9	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES	
10	Novus asserts the following separate and additional defenses to Plaintiff's Complaint	
11	without assuming the burden of proof on such defenses that would otherwise fall on Plaintiff.	
12	Novus reserves the right to supplement or amend these defenses as discovery is conducted, and	
13	does not knowingly or intentionally waive any applicable separate and additional defense.	
14	First Affirmative Defense: Waiver	
15	Plaintiff has knowingly and voluntarily waived any claims it might have against	
16	Defendant.	
17	Second Affirmative Defense: Equitable Defenses	
18	Plaintiff's claims are barred under such equitable defenses as the evidence may	
19	demonstrate, including, but not limited to, the doctrines of laches, estoppel, duress, and undue	
20	burden.	
21	Third Affirmative Defense: Section 687(c) of the Act	
22	Plaintiff's claims are barred under Section 687c(c) of the Act.	
23	Fourth Affirmative Defense: Equity	
24	The SBA may not ask this Court to impose a Receivership on Defendant unless and until	
25	this Court determines that it would be fair and equitable to do so in accordance with applicable	
26	statutory requirements. The SBA will unable to meet its burden demonstrating that a	
27	Receivership is fair and equitable given the facts and circumstances of this case, because (among	
28	other reasons) the SBA has acknowledged (as it reasonably must) that it expects to be paid in full	

1258053/SF

Case5:12-cv-00523-LHK Document5 Filed03/13/12 Page6 of 6

1	in the event a receivership is not ordered by this Court given the strength of the portfolio
2	companies remaining in Defendant's fund.
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
4	WHEREFORE, Novus prays for relief and judgment as follows:
5	1. That the Court deny Plaintiff's prayer for relief in its entirety and that the Court dismiss
6	the Complaint with prejudice and enter judgment in Novus's favor and against Plaintiff;
7	2. That the Court award Novus its costs and expenses that it incurs in this action and
8	attorneys' fees as permitted by law; and
9	3. That the Court award Novus such other and further relief that it deems appropriate
10	
11	Dated: March 13, 2012 COOLEY LLP
12	
13	
14	By: <u>/s/ Gordon C. Atkinson</u> Gordon C. Atkinson
15	Attorneys for Defendant
16	NOVUŠ VENTURES II, L.P.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	DEFENDANT'S ANSWED TO DI AINTIEF'S

COOLEY LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

1258053/SF

DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR RECEIVERSHIP AND INJUNCTION (CASE NO. 12-CV-00523-HRL)